

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 588

EA 021 076

AUTHOR Egelston, Richard L.
TITLE The New York State Model for Sharing Successful Programs: A Decade of Implementation and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 89
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization (Portsmouth, NH, April 26-28, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *Shared Resources and Services
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

To address educational reform needs in New York State, the State Education Department developed a research-based Sharing Successful Practices (SSP) Dissemination model. Under SSP, a program successful in meeting one district's needs can be adopted by other districts with similar needs. SSP has four components: validation, demonstration, replication, and technical assistance. An evaluation of SSP must consider model characteristics as well as what happens after the model is implemented. In the report, several studies conducted over a period of years are synthesized to demonstrate that SSP is an effective tool in bringing about educational change. The report specifically shows that SSP has content and construct validity; is reliable and cost-effective; is more efficient than developing a local program; and is perceived as useful by local school districts. In addition, local school district evaluation data indicate that replicating validated programs is successful. Participation rates are high, with over 85 percent of the school districts participating in replication during the 12-year period. More than 12,000 adoptions have taken place, with a large number happening in urban schools. Five tables and 16 references are included. (MLH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

The New York State Model For Sharing Successful Programs:
A Decade of Implementation and Evaluation

by

Richard L. Egelston, NYS Education Department

Presented at the Annual Conference of the
New England Educational Research Organization
Portsmouth, New Hampshire
April 27, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Richard L.
Egelston*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The New York State Model For Sharing Successful Programs:
A Decade of Implementation and Evaluation
by
Richard L. Egelston, NYS Education Department

Within New York State, local school districts and the Board of Regents have identified needs of students over the past twelve years, and have attempted to identify various solutions to those needs. These needs were the same ones which have been identified by the series of national studies of education which were published during the past five years: lack of knowledge about basic skills, excessive number of drop-outs, lack of higher order thinking skills, etc. One of the solutions developed by the State Education Department was the Sharing Successful Practices (SSP) dissemination model. SSP is predicated on the assumption that a program which is successful in meeting the needs of one district can be adopted by other districts with similar needs and is based on a combination of research models reported by Clark and Guba (1972), Havelock (1973), Berman and McLaughlin (1974-78), and Hall and Loucks (1977). Crandall and his associates (1982-83) have identified all of the major activities and procedures of SSP as being descriptive of those dissemination models which result in the most successful adoptions of innovative programs in schools they studied.

SSP consists of four components: validation, demonstration, replication, and technical assistance. Validation concerns judging whether the evaluation of a program has resulted in convincing evidence the program works. Demonstration concerns making the validated program available to other school districts which have a need for it. Replication concerns installing the validated program in new locations. Technical assistance is provided to school districts which either seek validation, or which demonstrate programs, or which replicate programs.

An evaluation of SSP must consider the characteristics of the model as well as what happens after the model is implemented. Several studies conducted over a period of years will be synthesized to demonstrate SSP is an effective tool in bringing about educational change. Specifically it will be shown that: SSP has content and construct validity; is reliable; is cost-effective, is more efficient than developing a local program; and is perceived to be useful by local school districts. In addition, local school evaluation data indicate that replicating validated programs is successful. Participation rates are high, with over 85 percent of the school districts participating in replication during the twelve year period. More than 12,000 adoptions have taken place, with a large number of them in urban schools.

The Validation Process

The need for validating programs stems largely from a major weakness in the sharing of ideas and information about programs: the lack of evidence supporting the claims that an educational program works well in a particular situation. Many educators have expressed disappointment upon leaving a school site where an innovative project was presumably operating. Many truly promising practices were lost because potential adopters lost

confidence when answers to questions of cost, facilities, staff, pupil growth, and the like were generally unanswered because poor records were kept, or when no systematic data collection design was developed or followed.

Validation efforts were initiated in 1976, and have been modified several times since then. The current version is described below. More complete details may be found in the Handbook for the New York State Education Department Validation Process (1988). Validation is a peer review process in which the State Education Department acts as a facilitator between the applicant and the review panel. SED has developed the procedures and criteria which are applied by people outside the Department.

The process is initiated through a referral and/or an inquiry from a school district. Interested parties contact the State Education Department, and receive information and guidance in the process. Occasionally evaluation specialists are provided to the project to help them collect evidence and prepare the application for validation. In other cases a school district (or other agency with an educational program) is ready to prepare and submit an application for validation based upon evidence already collected.

The application for validation is a technical evaluation report which describes the educational program objectives, activities, curricula, target groups, instrumentation, evaluation design, results, and resources necessary to replicate the program. Curricular documents and locally developed evaluation instruments are also examined. The evaluation evidence is reviewed for reliability, validity, size of effects, and educational significance. Curricula are reviewed for currency, relevance, conformity to good instructional practice, and congruence with Federal and State regulations. Preliminary drafts of the application are encouraged, and opportunity to amend "final drafts" of the application are provided.

When the application for validation has been revised to include a description of all salient features of the program, a technical assistance visit is made to the applicant. This visit is conducted by an evaluation specialist who may help the applicant clarify objectives, verify the program description and evaluation evidence in the application, and plan the presentation of evidence to the validation panel.

Evaluating the evidence contained in the application is the function of the seven member validation panel which is convened for one day. The panel reviews the application in advance of the meeting. During the morning of the meeting day, the panel discusses what they have read in order to come to a common understanding about the program, and to identify any points which need clarification or amplification. In the afternoon, the applicants make an oral presentation to the panel which is intended to supplement the application. A question and answer session preceeds an executive session in which the panel forms a recommendation concerning validation. Validation Certificates are awarded to successful applicants. Panel members represent the following constituencies: evaluators, school administrators, curriculum development/instructional design specialists, content specialists, school boards, teacher unions, and PTA parents.

During the Summer of 1976, the initial validation process was installed. Applications were solicited and quickly reviewed to identify projects which would become demonstration projects. Most of the projects had been funded with ESEA Title III funds, and had been known to SED staff. Eighty projects were submitted, and 46 were validated. The process was revised shortly thereafter, and more rigorous procedures installed. Since December 1, 1976, 186 projects have become involved in the validation process. As of April 1, 1989, 84 have been validated, 2 have been withdrawn prior to a decision, 79 have been rejected, and 21 are still in progress. Of the 21, 8 have received evaluation assistance, but have not submitted an application. Applicants have included local school districts, intermediate school districts (BOCES), campus schools, State Agencies, and not-for-profit organizations. Among the local school districts have been large and small city districts, suburban districts, and large and small rural districts.

Demonstrating Validated Programs

When a program becomes validated, the applicant is provided with a demonstration grant to conduct several activities. Awareness brochures which can be easily distributed are created, and training guides and other resource material developed. Presentations are made at state conferences where people who attend the conference might be interested in the program. Demonstrators, are also encouraged to identify at least one district which will immediately adopt the program, with noncompetitive grant funds. Personnel costs including travel are included in the grant to the Demonstration district. Technical assistance for the preceding activities is also provided.

A Demonstration district (D/D) is provided continuation grants for two additional years in order to build statewide awareness of the program, and to secure several replication districts. If there is a continuing need for the program to be adopted within the state, the D/D may be funded for two additional years, and are allowed to demonstrate the program for as long as the program exists.

Each validated program is summarized and included in New York State Educational Programs That Work, which is published by The New York State Education Department. This catalog is distributed to every school superintendent in New York State, and to other people upon request, each Spring as a part of an announced competitive grant round for funding replications of validated programs.

Replication of Validated Programs

School districts and other agencies may adopt a validated program using funds from any source, and at any time. However, the State Education Department conducts two grant programs for replication: one competitive, and one invitational, each year. Successful applicants may secure funding

to cover staff stipends or substitutes, travel costs, honoraria for the D/D trainers along with their travel costs, and classroom materials to implement the program. Grants are for one year, although it is possible for an applicant to be funded for the project again, providing new staff are triained from a different school.

Technical assistance is provided to the replication districts through a network of ten regional facilitators (RF's) who are provided with resources for several activities. The RF's are familiar with the validated programs, and the needs of school districts within their regions. RF's make local districts aware of the programs which are available, and assist them in preparing grant applications for the grant competition.

In addition to replicating New York State validated programs, nationally validated programs may be replicated under Sharing Successful Programs. In fact, in recent years, the number of replications of nationally validated programs has far exceeded the number of state validated programs replicated. Fourteen New York State validated programs have also been validated nationally.

Evaluating Sharing Successful Programs

An evaluation of the dissemination process must consider the characteristics of the process as well as what happens as a result of the process. Standard evaluation models have not been used, however, a number of unrelated studies present evidence of success all of which point to the overall success of the validation process.

Validity Studies of the Validation Process. Content validity for the validation process was established with two studies. In the first, Egelston (1979b) studied qualitative differences between applications for validation which were approved or disapproved during the initial review. The total population of 62 applications was divided into "applications approved" (N = 38), and "applications disapproved" (N = 24). Applications disapproved averaged 11.7 problems which were spread throughout all categories of information requested in the application. Conversely, those projects approved averaged only 1.1 problems, again spread over most categories. Approximately 95 percent of the errors were errors of omission, rather than commission. A revised Handbook for Validation containing elaborate explanations of what was critical to include in each section of the application was then developed and published.

In the second study, a panel of twenty-six experienced validation consultants reviewed several drafts of the Handbook. Drafts were revised until all consultants agreed that the guidelines for preparing the application were clear, and covered all relevant aspects of evaluation. These panel members also reviewed the guidelines for reviewing applications and agreed that there was an exact match between the sections required in the application and the review, and that the criteria for reviewing applications were appropriate.

Construct validity of the New York State validation process was examined (Egelston, 1979a) by comparing the written guidelines with the Standards For Evaluation of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials (Joint Committee, 1981). A preliminary draft of the Standards was used which describe 29 (of the current 30) standards which should be considered in evaluation (11 Accuracy standards, 7 [of 8] Utility standards, 8 Propriety standards and 3 Feasibility standards). Four point rating scales were used to judge how well each standard was met. Thirteen of the 29 standards were rated as being covered well, six as fair, two as poor, and eight as not covered at all. Some of the latter group were not considered as appropriate for the validation process. Guidelines for the validation process were subsequently clarified so that pertinent standards previously not included were incorporated, and others modified.

Cromack (1979) used fourteen of the standards (11 Accuracy standards, 2 Utility standards, and 1 propriety standard) to determine if they could be applied for the purpose of discriminating: (A) projects approved for validation from projects disapproved, and (B) projects approved but not validated from projects approved and validated. A random sample of 14 applications was selected and the information relating to each standard was rated using a five point scale. Discriminant functions using the standards were generated. Subsequent reclassification of projects into groups using the discrimination functions indicated that the standards could be used to predict if projects would be approved, and validated. It was again concluded the validation process possessed construct validity.

Since the validation process strongly suggests a consensus be reached by the validation panel, reliability of the process has been assured. There is a provision, however, for minority reports to be filed in the cases where a consensus has not been reached. Only 2 of the 81 programs recommended for validation have had less than consensus.

The first projects were validated in 1976, and were provided with demonstration grants. For both 1976-77 and 1977-78 the funds for replication were contained within the demonstration grants. Beginning in 1978-79 a competitive grant process was held for replication, and has been conducted every year since. A total of 97 Demonstration projects have been replicated in 1,339 schools. Additional replications may have taken place with local funding, and may have involved other demonstration projects. Table 1 reports the number of demonstration projects and replication grants by year and location. Data for the total state and for the big 5 cities are provided. Approximately 32 percent of the demonstration grants and 24 percent of the replication grants have been held by New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers.

An adoption occurs when a teacher has been trained. The adoption is counted as an adoption for the school in which the teacher is located for the target group of the program. If several teachers are trained simultaneously, but teach in several school buildings within a district, then each of those buildings is counted once. The determination of an adoption is generally made from attendance rosters collected during training experiences. Nonpublic school buildings are also counted in a similar manner.

Table 2 provides the number of adoptions of nationally validated programs reported for each of the big cities in New York, and for the whole state. Data from 1976-79 were not reliably reported by districts, but the state totals are more reliable. As expected, New York City has the largest number of adoptions, with the other cities closely ranked in the number of adoptions by size. Thirty-one percent of the adoptions in New York State have occurred in the big cities which have 39 percent of the students. The number of adoptions by the five cities has increased over the past several years, until more than half of the statewide adoptions in 1987-88 occurred within the cities. Since only a relatively small number of these adoptions have been funded through SSP grants, it appears that the cities now consider adoption of validated programs to be a very successful way of implementing educational change.

Sharing Successful Programs also includes the opportunity for school districts to replicate programs which have been validated by the Federal Government under either JDRP or PEP. The following sections summarize studies of replication etc. in which the New York State validated programs were not separated from nationally validated programs. Since 1976, at least 1,989 adoptions of State and nationally validated programs have been funded with State grants, and an estimated 10,000 adoptions have been funded locally or with Federal funds from sources other than replication grants.

Replication Success. Each year since 1982, recipients of replication grants have been asked to file a final program report with SED. Two questions have been included on the form: 1) "Has the program been successful, in your judgment?", and "Will the program be continued next year using local funds?" The first question gets at the perception of success by the contact person, and the second gets at how valued the program is. From 1982-1987, 148 of 172 program reports indicated the program would be continued with local funding. From 1984-1987, 91 of 109 program reports indicated the program was a success (this question was not asked in 1982, or 1983).

In June of 1987, each of 17 Demonstrators of a state validated program which had at least one replicator during the past three years was interviewed over the telephone. The purpose of the interview was to determine the extent of their work with replicators, and to find out what types of problems they encountered that would affect the quality of replication. Most of these demonstrators had neither received a demonstration grant, nor had been provided with technical assistance, and most were relatively inexperienced as demonstrators. None of the 17 reported any problems which interfered with replications of their program. Several demonstrators did note, however, that demonstration activities were time consuming (including giving up a great deal of free time), which made it difficult to catch-up with their normal duties.

In May, 1987 sixteen project directors were randomly chosen from districts replicating both state and nationally validated programs. Again, the focus was on the extent of involvement with the D/D, and with

any problems which affected the quality of replication. Each replicator identified some problem, but there were few problems mentioned more than once. The range of problems with demonstrators were from outdated materials and voluminous materials to scheduling training and follow-up. The range of problems with the State Education Department were from a short time for preparing a grant application to small grant awards. Local problems related to a shortage of staffing for preparing the grant applications to managing the implementation.

Replicators for the 1986-87 school year were requested to complete a 15 item questionnaire about various aspects of their interaction with the demonstrator. Of twenty-five returns, only two had any negative comments about the demonstrator. One replicator indicated that costs charged by the D/D were higher than the D/D had indicated; that technical assistance had been promised, but was not delivered; and that evaluation and reporting requirements were not explained. The other respondent also indicated inaccurate cost information was given; that implementation requirements were inaccurately described; and that the trainers were poorly prepared. Both programs were NDN demonstrators.

Detailed feedback of all applications for validation is routinely provided by SED at several stages of the process: planning to submit the application, after initial submission of the application, and during the formal review of the application. Most of the applicants have expressed appreciation for the assistance provided.

Programs which become demonstrators are expected to assist replicating districts with evaluation of their programs. For those replicators in which training was completed in the summer or early in the academic year report comparable results (gains) to those the Demonstrator found prior to validation. However, some of the programs reported failure, although the reason(s) for failure had little to do with the quality of the program being replicated.

A contract was awarded to an outside evaluator in 1980 to conduct a two-part study of the Replication Process. In Part 1, twelve case studies were done by selecting four replicators from each of three demonstrators. The generalizability of the findings were tested from a broad surveys of project directors and superintendents of districts receiving replication grants between 1976 and 1980. In Part 2, forty-one D/D projects (27 developed in New York State, and 14 non-New York State) were asked to provide names of replicators meeting four levels of success in replication. Responses from 218 of the 272 replications were received. The sample was more heavily weighted toward recently funded projects. Some of the findings which indicate that replication grants were a successful way to meet local needs were reported by Magi (1981):

1. An estimated 80 percent of the schools that initiated a replication had adopted either all or part of the program, or were still actively involved in the replication process.
2. Fifty-five percent of the schools which initiated a program

continued the full program after grant funding was discontinued. Another 21 percent continued at a somewhat lower level of activity, and 13 percent more were using either materials or procedures from the D/D.

3. Replications from projects developed in New York State were twice as likely to be discontinued as projects developed out of state. Building principals of projects developed in New York State were half as likely to be trained and directly involved with planning and decision-making as principals of projects developed outside of New York State.
4. Replicators of New York State developed projects were twice as likely to have had contact with the D/D prior to training as compared to replicators of NDN developed projects.
5. Approximately 33 percent of the projects replicating out of state projects had no contact with the D/D following training, while only 5 percent of the replicators of in state projects reported no contact.
6. The per-pupil cost of adopting a validated practice is about one percent of the per-pupil cost for developing the same program.
7. Approximately 50 percent of the school districts attempting to replicate a program did not conduct a formal needs assessment, but relied mainly on existing student test scores, and/or informal teacher and administrator surveys.
8. About 90 percent of the superintendents reported that the two most important outcomes of replication were: Increased knowledge or skills among students, and increased knowledge of instructional skills among teachers.
9. Approximately 75 percent of the superintendents from replicating school districts reported that facilitating educational change through replicating exemplary programs was either very or extremely effective.
10. Approximately 90 percent of the superintendents said they would not have replicated the new program without the availability of outside funds. The most essential expenditure was for the trainer, followed by expenditures for materials, travel, and substitute teachers. The same percentage of superintendents said the amount of replication funds were either adequate, or more than adequate.

Cost-effectiveness. Cost-effectiveness, from the standpoint of Sharing Successful Programs, refers to the use of resources by the NYSED. Table 3 reports estimated administrative costs and actual grant award totals for each year from 1976-77 through March of 1988-89. Estimated costs of administration total \$920,000, while the amount for grants totals

\$28,885,865. Over 96 percent of the funding for Sharing Successful Programs has been provided to school districts.

Table 4 reports the number of grants, and the total amount of grant awards for each grant type for each year of the program. If the costs of administration, validation grants, demonstration grants, and technical assistance grants are combined (\$16,480,967) and divided by the number of replication grants (1,889) the cost to produce a funded adoption was \$8,286 (assuming only one adoption per replication grant). The average replication grant was \$6,700, and the average total cost per funded adoption was nearly \$15,000.

The total number of funded and unfunded adoptions of programs nationally validated was 10,519 from 1977-1988 (see Table 5). This number included adoptions from programs which received both State and national validation. However, several programs have been validated by the State which have not been validated nationally and have provided several hundred other adoptions. Unfortunately accurate records of these adoptions have not been maintained, but 1,339 grants were given for replication. Many of these grants were for consortia of schools. If the \$29,805,865 is divided by the total number of adoptions of both state and nationally validated programs (estimated at 11,500), and counting only one adoption for each consortia, the average cost per adoption was \$2,592.

Table 5 also reports the number of teachers trained, and the number of students affected by these teachers during the initial year of training for the NDN replications under the assumption that each teacher trained in the program implemented it. If the state validated programs were prorated with the same averages the number of teachers trained would be 44,521, and the number of students affected during the first year would be 1,041,382. With a single year of implementation, the cost per student (1976-88) was \$27.07. Assuming an average of three years of implementation, the cost per student is approximately \$9.02. With additional years of implementation, the cost goes down, and the impact of Sharing Successful Programs increases.

Egelston (1981b) contrasted the cost-effectiveness of two models for producing educational change. The first model, called the Title III model, consisted of grants given for development of an innovative program. The second, called the Title IV-C model, consisted of grants given for demonstration, and replication. No local costs were considered for either model, and no costs for technical assistance or SED administration of the model were included.

Cost of development was determined by totalling the grant awards for each Developer project initiated during 1976 and 1977, since these were the projects which had completed development by 1981. Most grants were renewed from two to three times, although a few projects required only one year of funding, and a few others required five years. The average cost for 177 projects was \$92,677, with individual grants ranging from \$5,000 to \$395,534.

Demonstration grants were given to validated programs starting in

1976 and were renewed from one to three times. Grants averaged about \$50,000 annually and funded trainers for at least half-time. Sixty-seven projects were selected which began demonstrating in 1976, 1977, 1978, or 1979. These demonstrators served 923 replications during the same period of time. Grants for replicating a single project were provided only for one year, and averaged about \$7,400. Grants were included for years 1976 through 1980. Included among the 923 replication grants, were 70 awarded to consortia of districts. Other grants served more than one building (including nonpublic schools) within a district. The total number of adoptions probably exceeded 1300. The mean cost was conservatively estimated per adoption to be \$16,964.

During the period under study, the cost of administration and technical assistance was estimated to be evenly divided between development and dissemination. When divided among the 177 development and 923 replications, the effect upon development was about four times that of replication, and the cost of development was conservatively estimated to be four times that of adoption. Programs validated were funded from a variety of sources such as Elementary and Secondary Education Act Titles I, III, IV-C, and the Career Education Incentive Act.

School District Participation. From the state perspective it is necessary to have a continuing participation in the dissemination process by districts of all sizes and locations throughout the state. An analysis of three factors relating to participation in grant competitions for the replication of State and nationally validated programs was reported by Egelston (1981a). Correlations between the number of applications for replication grants submitted by single school districts between 1976 and 1981, total expenditure per weighted average daily attendance in 1977-78, operating expenditure per weighted average daily attendance in 1977-78, and enrollment coded to the nearest 100 students for 1978-79. New York City was not included in the analyses.

The correlations between the two measures of wealth and number of proposals submitted were near zero, but the correlation between the number of proposals submitted and enrollment was .63 ($p < .001$). Larger districts tended to submit more proposals than smaller districts. A more detailed analysis of this variable indicated that 470 of the 735 districts submitted 1,352 applications over the six year period. Over half of the districts with fewer than the median number of students had never submitted a grant application on their own behalf, and about half of the remainder had submitted only one. Most of these small districts, however, were included in 206 grant applications submitted by intermediate school districts (not included above) for consortia of schools. As a result of this study, special credit was given to districts submitting replication grant proposals for the first time in order to induce them to compete.

In another study involving the same data (Egelston, 1982), district size was divided into three categories: Small (enrollment < 1250), medium ($1250 < \text{enrollment} < 3050$), and large (enrollment > 3050), and participation was examined through Markov chain analyses. Both the transition matrices and the limiting vectors were subjected to t-tests. Large districts were

significantly more likely to submit grant applications than small districts, but neither was significantly different from the middle size districts.

Similar analyses were carried out for grant awards. Large districts were more likely to receive replication grants two years in succession than either small or middle sized districts, but there were no significant differences between small and middle sized districts. However, since large districts were likely to submit more grant applications in any given year (Egelston, 1981a), they are also more likely to receive a grant award in that same year.

Endorsement by the Board of Regents and SED. In October, 1986 the Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education forwarded a "Report on the Transferring Success Program" to the Board of Regents. The report described the program, and provided some examples of how school districts have benefitted from replication. An oral presentation to the Regents expanded on the impact of Transferring Success within the state. As a result, the Board of Regents formally endorsed the program, and has indicated (The State Education Department, 1987b, p. 14-15; & 1987d, p. 1-2) it as one of the models for improving education in areas of critical need. The State Education Department also sponsored a conference in New York City, on November 19-20, 1987 entitled "Sharing Successful Programs Conference." Approximately 450 school administrators and teachers attended the conference. Awareness sessions for several programs were conducted, and technical assistance sessions regarding validation, demonstration, and replication were also held.

The Ad Hoc Committee and Legislative Response. In 1982, after ESEA Title IV-C had been incorporated into ECIA Chapter 2, an Ad Hoc Committee for Transferring Success was formed, and was comprised of 34 school superintendents and other school administrators. This committee organized a letter writing campaign from a wide variety of school representatives to key state legislators for the purpose of lobbying for State funds to be authorized for replication grants. About 400 letters were generated from public and private schools. The Committee continued to lobby annually, until they were successful. Since 1984, the State Legislature has made from \$250,000 to \$475,000 available for replication grants. In 1986, \$4,500 of ECIA Chapter 2 funds were added by SED to support validation, and in 1987 the amount was increased to \$20,000 to expand validation efforts, and to add technical assistance in evaluation for promising practices. In 1987, the State Legislature added \$91,000 to fund 29 selected Demonstration projects (most had never received funding as a demonstrator) to develop awareness and training materials, conduct awareness sessions, and to secure one replication district.

Conclusion

The series of studies summarized above, and the new studies reported herein, indicate the dissemination model Sharing Successful Programs is an effective tool in bringing about educational change. The process has content and construct validity, and is reliable. Furthermore the process

results in selecting projects which are perceived to be useful by local school districts, and in which evaluation data indicate program success. The cost of operating the dissemination model (which includes validation) by a state agency is much less than the cost of development, and can bring about the installation of a new program one year sooner than allowing districts to develop innovations from scratch. Participation rates are high, with over 85 percent of the school districts participating in replication during the twelve year period. A local school district advocacy group was successful in securing financial support for continuing all aspects of the dissemination model (including validation) from the State Legislature when Federal funding was discontinued. SSP is being used by urban areas as an effective means for improving their schools.

Table 1

Number of NYS Funded Demonstration Programs
and Replications By Year and location¹

Year	Statewide D/D's	Statewide Replications	Urban ² D/D's	Urban ² Replications
1976-77	10 (4)	88 [59]	2 (2)	17 [17]
1977-78	37 (4)	219 [51]	9 (2)	58 [22]
1978-79	40 (3)	257 [34]	8 (2)	49 [19]
1979-80	42 (3)	207 [13]	10 (2)	52 [13]
1980-81	46 (1)	221 [3]	12 (1)	50 [3]
1981-82	37	143	9	39
1982-83	23	45	7	11
1983-84	15	28	6	7
1984-85	15	26	5	6
1985-86	10	17	2	2
1986-87	7	17	4	6
1987-88	22	39	7	9
1988-89	17	32	9	14
Undup. Tot.	<u>97</u> (4)	<u>1,339</u> [160]	<u>31</u> (2)	<u>320</u> [74]

¹The numbers in parentheses refer to projects nationally validated, but which were provided NYS D/D grants. The numbers in brackets refer to the number of replicators secured by these D/D's.

²New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers.

Table 2
NDN Adoption Data For Each Big City By Year¹

<u>Year</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>Buff</u>	<u>Roch</u>	<u>Syr</u>	<u>Yon</u>	<u>Total State</u>
1976-77	?	?	?	?	?	57
1977-78	?	?	3	?	?	556
1978-79	1(?)	?	16(?)	?	?	646
1979-80	81	43	2	0	0	658
1980-81	84	1	1	0	0	493
1981-82	300	82	7	0	8	1,242
1982-83	200	59	28	29	6	1,341
1983-84	150	49	18	3	6	868
1984-85	221	63	14	0	7	742
1985-86	365	33	30	39	18	1,325
1986-87	205	29	25	23	9	990
1987-88	774	27	18	9	35	1,601
1988-89 ²						
Totals	2,381	386	159	103	89	10,519

¹ Sources of data were the Applications for funding the NYS Facilitator Project submitted to the National Diffusion Network. Data from Demonstration Projects did not have to be verified and reported to the State Facilitator Office prior to 1980, hence the data from early years are not reliable.

² Not available.

Table 3

Estimates of Expenditure for Grant Administration
and Grants Awarded By Source¹

Component	Year	Federal \$	State \$	Total \$
Administration Grants	1976-77	70,000 1,160,704	0 0	1,230,704
Administration Grants	1977-78	79,000 3,259,248	0 0	3,338,248
Administration Grants	1978-79	88,000 4,478,530	0 0	4,566,530
Administration Grants	1979-80	97,000 6,389,053	0 0	6,486,053
Administration Grants	1980-81	106,000 5,857,072	0 0	5,963,072
Administration Grants	1981-82	115,000 3,348,719	0 0	3,348,834
Administration Grants	1982-83	0 252,000	43,000 0	295,000
Administration Grants	1983-84	0 206,500	46,000 0	252,500
Administration Grants	1984-85	0 0	49,000 250,000	299,000
Administration Grants	1985-86	0 174,731	52,000 250,681	477,412
Administration Grants	1986-87	0 70,000	55,000 271,543	396,543
Administration Grants	1987-88	0 171,164	58,000 1,306,750	1,535,932
Administration Grants ²	1988-89	0 200,000	62,000 1,354,047	1,616,047
Totals	1976-89	26,007,836	3,763,021	28,805,865

¹ Estimates for administration are based upon .5 FTE from 1976-1981, and .1 FTE from 1982-1988 for six professionals and 1 nonprofessional.

² Grants awarded as of April 1, 1989.

Table 4

Amount and Number of Grants Awarded By Year Under Sharing Successful Programs¹

Program Year	Replication				Validation		Demonstration		Tech. Asst.	
	NYS		NDN		NYS		NYS		NYS	
	\$	#	\$	#	\$	#	\$	#	\$	#
1976-77	551,714	88	0	0	116,236	18	492,754	18	294,671	25
1977-78	933,655	219	0	0	193,869	19	2,131,724	47	351,739	25
1978-79	1,784,940	257	298,312	5	0	0	2,395,278	45	979,306	25
1979-80	2,046,488	207	743,924	102	61,677	10	3,536,964	63	788,956	25
1980-81	1,624,665	221	845,431	106	0	0	3,386,996	66	735,621	25
1981-82	971,286	143	613,836	68	0	0	1,763,597	38	747,035	24
1982-83	140,796	45	111,204	25	0	0	0	0	71,500	49
1983-84	111,590	28	94,910	24	0	0	0	0	71,500	49
1984-85	47,565	26	202,435	48	0	0	0	0	71,500	49
1985-86	55,343	17	370,069	41	0	0	0	0	71,500	49
1986-87	80,560	17	260,983	47	4,500	2	0	0	36,000	09
1987-88	213,655	39	508,393	88	20,000	1	77,500	22	658,374	16
1987-89 ²	275,524	32	437,620	42	20,000	1	111,492	17	709,411	10
Totals	8,837,781	1,339	4,487,117	650	416,282	51	14,376,305	316	5,587,113	381

¹Funds awarded in this table are from both State and Federal sources. Column headings refer to New York State or National Diffusion Network programs. Programs receiving both NYS and JDRP validation have generally been classified as NYS programs.

²1988-89 data are accurate to April 1, 1989.

Table 5

Adoption Information for NDN Programs from 1977-1988¹

Program Year	No. of Adoptions Public	NonPub.	No. of Teachers Trained	No. of Students Affected
1976-1977	51	6	?	?
1977-1978	520	36	1,269	25,013
1978-1979	591	55	1,365	27,315
1979-1980	590	68	3,394	55,040
1980-1981	465	28	3,197	48,146
1981-1982	1,207	35	4,725	111,495
1982-1983	1,185	156	4,532	115,906
1983-1984	802	66	4,464	99,137
1984-1985	704	38	2,965	79,888
1985-1986	1,309	16	4,486	133,115
1986-1987	941	49	3,639	135,701
1987-1988	1,519	82	6,536	233,879
Totals	9,884	635	40,572	949,240

¹Data in this table were taken from the series of grant applications to the National Diffusion Network for the New York State Facilitator Project except for 1976-77. Adoptions include those which were provided grants under Sharing Successful Programs as well as those funded from other sources. Since some NYS validated Programs have also been validated nationally, adoptions from them have been counted in this table.

REFERENCES

- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change (8 vols.). Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1974-1978.
- Clark, D. L. & Guba, E. G. A re-examination of a test of the "Research and Development" model of change. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1972, 83 (Autumn).
- Crandall, D. P. & Associates. People, Policies, and Practices: Examining the Chain of School Improvement (10 vols.). Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc., 1982-1983.
- Cromack, T. R. A field test of the Standards for evaluation in evaluating applications for validation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evaluation Network, Cincinnati, OH 1979.
- Egelston, R. L. A field test of the "Standards" in evaluating the NYSED validation process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evaluation Network, Cincinnati, OH 1979a.
- Egelston, R. L. An examination of rejected evaluation reports: A metaevaluation of applications for validation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Education Research Association, Ellenville, NY 1979b.
- Egelston, R. L. Public school leadership and competitive grant participation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Ellenville, NY 1981a.
- Egelston, R. L. Recurring participation in a competitive grants program for public schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization, Lenox, MA 1982.
- Egelston, R. L. Transferring educational success: Is the ESEA Title IV-C model more cost effective than the Title III model in New York State? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization, Lenox, MA 1981b.
- Hall, G. E. & Loucks, S. F. A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 13, 263-276.
- Havelock, R. G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.
- MAGI Educational Services. A Study of the Replication Process in New York State, Larchmont, NY: Author, 1981.

The State Education Department. Handbook for the New York State Education Department Validation Process, Albany, NY: Author, 1988.

The State Education Department. Increasing High School Completion Rates: A Framework for State and Local Action, Albany, NY: Author, 1987a.

The State Education Department. Transferring Success: Educational Programs That Work for Increasing High School Completions through Better Beginnings and School Improvement, Albany, NY: Author, 1987b.